M.H.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/824,621	04/02/2001	Harold Mattice	403120	1062

7590 02/13/2003

Harold V. Stotland, Seyfarth Shaw
55 East Monroe Street, Suite 4200
Chicago, IL 60603-5803

EXAMINER
WHITE, CARMEN D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3714	

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/824,621	Applicant(s) MATTICE ET AL.
	Examiner Carmen D. White	Art Unit 3714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. (abstract) (Abstract is too long)

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4 .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Abstract

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet *within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length* since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 27-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ***LeMay*** et al (6,439,996).

Regarding claim 27, LeMay teaches a gaming machine having a mechanical key operated lock assembly that includes an actuator member movable by a key between locking and unlocking conditions, access control apparatus comprising an electrically operable lock mechanism movable between first and second conditions, control circuitry

coupled to the lock mechanism and the lock member preventing or allowing unlocking {access to control system} of the area, depending on proper authorization (col. 2, lines 62-67 through col. 3,lines 1-23; Fig. 1). LeMay is silent regarding the lock mechanism being a latch. The examiner takes official notice that it is well known in the art to use latches as locks. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ a latch as the lock mechanism in LeMay in order to make the lock more reliable and less expensive.

Regarding claims 28-31, LeMay teaches all the limitations of the claims as discussed above. LeMay is silent on the explicit features of the lock mechanism being a motive device or a solenoid. However, the examiner takes official notice that these are well known features of locks. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ solenoids and motive devices in the lock mechanism of LeMay to make the parts of the mechanism more easily accessible and easier to mass-produce. Further, these types of locks are more dependable.

Claims 1-4, 9, 11 and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ***LeMay*** et al (6,439,996) in view of ***Lucero*** et al (4,072,930)..

Regarding claims 1 and 32, LeMay teaches an apparatus for selectively controlling access to one or more of plural areas of a gaming machine, the apparatus comprises plural electrically operable lock mechanisms {locked doors of the gaming machine as well as areas of memory that are unable to be accessed [interpreted by examiner as "locked"] without proper authorization} respectively associated with the areas and each movable between unlocked and locked {locked and unlocked doors and

access or no access to restricted area of machine's memory} conditions with respect to its associated area; control circuitry including a processor operating under control of a stored program and coupled to each of the lock mechanisms for controlling operation thereof; a data storage and retrieval system adapted to communicate with the processor and including that stores data including user data and access authorization data indicative of the areas of the machine for which a user is seeking access; a data input device coupled to the processor for inputting at least user identification data identifying a user seeking access to an area of the machine and the processor being responsive to input user data for operating one or more lock mechanisms in accordance with access authorization corresponding to an identified user (col. 2, lines 1-13 and lines 62-67 through col. 3, lines 1-41). While LeMay teaches that these restricted areas are accessible by authorized users, LeMay is silent regarding the explicit teaching of these users being authorized personnel with authorized identification. In an analogous gaming machine security device, Lucero teaches the identification of each attending personnel for access to a gaming machine (lines 8-10 of abstract). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the use of personnel identifiers, as taught by Lucero, in the machine of LeMay in order to provide additional security by ensuring that the authorized users are also current personnel of the casino or gaming establishment.

Regarding claim 2, LeMay and Lucero teach all the limitations of the claims as discussed above. LeMay further teaches the data input device including a keypad (col. 4, lines 19-25; col. 3, lines 30-31).

Regarding claims 3-4 and 33, LeMay and Lucero teach all the limitations of the claims as discussed above. LeMay further teaches the use of a card reader (col. 4, lines 24-25).

Regarding claims 9 and 34, LeMay and Lucero teach all the limitations of the claims as discussed above. LeMay further teaches a remote control apparatus in communication with the processor for remote control (col. 4, lines 1-5).

Regarding claim 11, LeMay and Lucero teach all the limitations of the claims as discussed above. LeMay teaches the use of a remote central computer that is in communication with the access key, which is in communication with the machine's local processor and contains the information regarding the identification of the user and his/her access authorization to a particular area (col. 4, lines 1-5). However, LeMay does not teach the features of a host storage device that stores a host program for controlling the host computer and a database including data relating to the identification of authorized users. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate a database for authorized users in the host {remote central computer} of LeMay instead of the key device in order to make sure that the user does not tamper with the information to illegally get authorized to areas that he/she is not authorized to open. This would increase the security of the system.

Claims 5-8, 10, 12-26 and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ***LeMay*** et al in view of ***Lucero*** et al, further in view of ***Muir*** (5,923,249).

Regarding claim 10, LeMay and Lucero teach all the limitations of the claim as discussed above. The references lack teaching the feature of an area including a switch. In an analogous security system for a gaming machine, Muir teaches the use of switches to monitor areas of a gaming machine (Fig. 1). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the switch of Muir in LeMay and Lucero in order to increase the sensitivity of the security system. The examiner takes official notice that switches are well known in the art for indicating opening and closing (locking and unlocking) of an area.

Regarding claims 5-6, 8,12-13,16 and 35, LeMay and Lucero teach all the limitations of the claims as discussed above. While LeMay teaches the use multiple doors and various accessible areas of the game machine, LeMay is silent regarding the doors being associated with a respective area for access and these areas having respective lock mechanisms. In an analogous gaming device security system, Muir teaches the association of various accessible areas of a gaming machine with a respective door with respective lock mechanisms (col. 2, lines 11-25 and lines 55-60). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ this feature of Muir in the combined inventions of LeMay and Lucero in order to make the system more secure; whereby, the user is prevented from even opening the door to the area in which he/she does not have access.

Regarding claim 7, LeMay, Lucero and Muir teach all the limitations of the claim as discussed above. While both LeMay and Muir teach the use of mechanical lock mechanisms (LeMay-col. 3, lines 6-7 and Muir- col. 2, line 55), the references are silent

regarding the use of a manual latch for a lock. The examiner takes official notice that it is well known in the art to use manual latches as locks. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ a manual latch as the lock mechanism in LeMay, Lucero and Muir in order to make the lock more reliable and less expensive.

Regarding claim 14, LeMay, Lucero and Muir teach all the limitations of the claim as discussed above. The references do not teach the communication of the conditions of the doors to the host computer. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to expand the capabilities of LeMay, Lucero and Muir to include this communication to the host {remote central computer} to make it harder for a user to illegally open a door; whereby, a third party, the host, would provide further monitoring of the doors of the machine.

Regarding claim 15, LeMay, Lucero and Muir teach all the limitations of the claims as discussed above. While LeMay teaches the use of a display for the gaming machine (col. 3, lines 25-27), LeMay is silent regarding the display being used to display the machine's condition. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include this feature in LeMay in order to provide immediate notification to the gaming authority personnel as well as users regarding the machine's status. This would increase the security of the system and prevent the machine from being used or tampered with without proper authorization. The examiner takes official notice that it is well known in the art to display machine status information on the displays of gaming machines.

Regarding claims 17-22 and 26, LeMay, Lucero and Muir teach all the limitations of the claims as discussed above. Muir further includes first and second optical transducers {emitters and receivers} that are coupled to a processor and that are associated with the lock and door for generating output signals indicative of the condition of the lock and door col. 3,lines 8-67 through col. 4, lines 1-50). Muir is silent regarding the lock being a bolt. However, the examiner takes official notice that it is well known in the art to use bolts for locks. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a bolt for a lock in Muir in order to make the lock more secure and reliable. It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the use of optical emitters and receivers, as taught by Muir, in LeMay and Lucero to make the system more secure and sensitive to invalid entry.

Regarding claims 23-25, LeMay, Lucero and Muir teach all the limitations of the claims as discussed above. As discussed above, Muir teaches the use of optical emitters and optical receivers to monitor lock and door conditions. Muir also teaches the use of mechanical locks (manual locks). However, Muir is silent regarding the explicit teachings of manual operation of a lock bolt and the indication of manual operation of the bolt by altering the optical pathway. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate these features in Muir in order to prevent the system from being alarmed in the event that a user decides to manually lock/unlock the areas of the machine. This would prevent the system from being inconvenienced by false alarms.

Regarding claim 36, LeMay, Lucero and Muir teach all the limitations of the claims as discussed above. The references are silent regarding the feature of a manual override key for each lock mechanism that provides an indication of when the lock has been manually operated. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ this feature in LeMay, Lucero and Muir to prevent the electronic system from falsely alarming in cases where manual key entry is used.

Attachment

Applicant is notified regarding the recent changes in 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Please see the attachment to this office action- Recent Statutory Changes to 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Pertinent Prior Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. LeStrange et al and McGunn teach secure access mechanisms.

USPTO Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carmen D. White whose telephone number is 703-308-5275. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Hughes can be reached on 703-308-1806. The fax phone numbers

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7768 for ***Non-official*** communications and 703-305-3579 for ***Official*** communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1078.

C. White
Patent Examiner